

The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul
Author(s): Madeline C. Zilfi
Source: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (Oct., 1986), pp. 251-269
Published by: The University of Chicago Press
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/544203
Accessed: 26-12-2019 08:59 UTC

THE KADIZADELIS: DISCORDANT REVIVALISM IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ISTANBUL*

MADELINE C. ZILFI, University of Maryland, College Park

In the seventeenth century, Istanbul's pulpits were shaken by denunciations of Ottoman religious leaders and of the pliant bounds of orthodoxy. In 1656, the historian and thinker Katib Çelebi (d. 1657) was moved to warn against the overzealousness of Istanbul's mosque preachers (*vaizan;* s., *vaiz*). He cautioned that preachers would best fulfill their charge "if they gently admonish and advise the people to turn towards the Sunna and to beware of innovation."[1] They "must not spread extremist notions and so provoke the people and sow dissension among the community of Muhammad."[2] Despite the efforts of Katib Çelebi and others fearful of the divisive extremes promoted by the so-called Kadızadeli disputes, religious conflict raged in the Ottoman capital throughout much of the seventeenth century. More than once between 1630 and 1680 the message of Istanbul's Friday sermonists erupted into bloody confrontations not only on the streets, but within the sacred precincts of the mosque.

The Kadızadeli offensive against innovation (*bida*), and against popular religion generally, was an outgrowth of the uncompromising hostility of Istanbul's premier Friday mosque preachers, led by Kadızade Mehmed b. Mustafa (d. 1635),[3] toward certain of the empire's major Sufi orders, symbolized in Kadızade's day by the Halveti shaikh Ebülhayr Mecdeddin Abdülmecid, known as Sivasi Efendi (d. 1639).[4] The debate that Kadızade and Sivasi stirred in Istanbul during their lifetimes continued to spill over to other Ottoman cities and to subsequent generations long after the original antagonists were dead.

On the face of it, the dispute recalled chronic tensions between holy law-defined "orthodoxy" and the methods and claims of Sufism, Islamic mysticism. The issues that shaped religious discourse in seventeenth-century Istanbul indeed echoed those that

* I gratefully acknowledge research support for this project from the Social Science Research Council and the University of Maryland General Research Board. There are transliteration inconsistencies due to the different styles appearing in the sources cited. I myself follow modern Turkish usage for proper names and technical terms, except that I prefer "b" to "p" and "d" to "t" where such choices exist at the end of syllables. For specifically Arabic names and terms, I use a simplified system of transliteration based on that used in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2d ed. Commonly used and frequently mentioned foreign words are italicized only the first time they appear.

[*JNES* 45 no. 4 (1986)]

0022-2968/86/4504-0001$1.00.

1 Kâtib Chelebi [Katib Çelebi], *The Balance of Truth*, trans. G. L. Lewis (London, 1957), p. 90 (hereafter *Balance*).

2 *Balance*, p. 99.

3 Şeyhi Mehmed, "Vekayi-i Fuzela," Istanbul, Süleymaniye Ktp., Hamidiye 939/1, fols. 32a–32b (hereafter Şeyhi); İbrahim Uşakizade, *Lebensbeschreibungen berühmter Gelehrten und Gottesmänner des osmanischen Reiches im 17. Jahrhundert*, ed. H. J. Kissling (Wiesbaden, 1965), pp. 43–45 (hereafter Uşakizade); Katib Çelebi, *Fezleke-i Tarih*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1286/1870), vol. 2, pp. 182–83 (hereafter *Fezleke*); Bursalı Mehmed Tahir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, 3 vols. (Istanbul, 1972–75), vol. 1, p. 373 (hereafter *OM*).

4 Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fols. 34a–35a; and below, pp. 225 ff.

had arisen in Islam in earlier centuries. Sufism's tendencies toward pantheism, syncretism, and emotive religiosity formed an irreducible core of conflict between the Sufi movement and religious spokesmen who claimed to uphold Islamic law (*sharia*) and, therewith, "true" Islam, against innovation and deviation. In the Ottoman case, however, there were factors at work that were peculiar both to the way in which Islam was practiced in the empire as well as to the specific religio-bureaucratic structures which the Ottomans had erected to oversee the direction of the faith. Although rhetorical lines were often drawn between "Sufism" and sharia-guided "orthodoxy," the conflict embraced a wider spectrum of protagonists and sympathies than the "Sufi-orthodox" dichotomy implies. The "Sufi" side of the dispute included any number of dignitaries who were not Sufis at all. The "orthodox" side, meanwhile, was directed by a leadership so narrow that it seldom represented the official guardians of sharia orthodoxy, the principal *ulema* of the realm.

In the three major Kadızadeli episodes in the century, the Sufi orders bore the brunt of Kadızadeli rhetoric and violence. Notwithstanding the centrality of the Sufis, the seriousness of the Kadızadeli challenge owes much to the underlying struggle between Kadızadeli puritanism and the pragmatism of ulema decision-makers. The clashes between the Kadızadelis and ranking ulema in the course of the century point up the complexity of conflict within the Ottoman religious establishment. Along with—indeed refining—the "Sufi-orthodox" split, the heart of the religious establishment, representing mosque and *medrese,* was divided against itself. The estrangement of the two principal groups of official Ottoman religious—the one, as mosque preachers, members of the less remunerative, less prestigious subhierarchy that also comprised provincial judges, professors, and jurisconsults, and the other, the true Ottoman ulema,[5] medrese-trained jurists holding the most lucrative professorships and judgeships in the realm—became even more acute as the Kadızadelis added career rivalries to ideology.

Kadızade Mehmed and his followers, called "Kadızadelis," "Kadızade-ites," were dogged foes of the Sufi movement of the time and of the belief system of popular Islam. Kadızade himself was born the son of a provincial judge in 1582 in the western Anatolian town of Balıkesir. After studying in his home province with the learned disciples of a fellow Balıkesir native, the renowned fundamentalist theologian Birgili Mehmed b. Pir Ali (d. 1573),[6] he eventually made his way to the imperial capital. In Istanbul he pursued a career as a mosque preacher, "the path of sermon and admonition" (*tarik-i vaz ve nasihat*), but soon abandoned the puritanical teachings of his Balıkesir mentors. He began to seek out the guidance of the Halveti shaikh Ömer Efendi (d. 1624), presiding shaikh of the Tercüman lodge in Istanbul.[7] Like Birgili Mehmed, who had also in his youth sought affiliation with a Sufi order, it soon

[5] In official Ottoman usage, the term "ulema," the "learned in the religious sciences," was generally restricted to the medrese-trained specialists in the holy law who served either as professors in one of a hierarchized set of Istanbul medreses or as ranking judges, called "great mollas," of the dozen or so major cities in the empire. The resulting "*ilmiye* hierarchy" was topped by two Chief Justices (*kadıasker*) and the *Şeyhülislam,* who achieved their high posts only after passing through the lower levels of training, teaching, and judgeships; below, pp. 266–67.

[6] "Birgili" or "Birgivi," "of (the town of) Birgi"; Nevizade Atai, *Zeyl-i Şakaik,* 2 vols. in 1 (Istanbul, 1268/1851–52), p. 179; and below, pp. 260–62 (hereafter Atai).

[7] *Fezleke,* vol. 2, p. 64; *OM,* vol. 1 p. 173; Atai, pp. 602–3, 759.

became clear that Kadızade and the Sufi way were incompatible. As with Birgili, despite an initial affinity, Kadızade's temperament and his religious predilections were determined to be unsuited to Sufism. He returned permanently to the preacher path with his earlier, more austere, approach to "sermon and admonition" intact. Rejecting emotive Sufism, he soon became its most virulent adversary.

After several years as a religious instructor at the Murad Pasha mosque in Istanbul, he was appointed Friday preacher at the mosque of Sultan Selim I in recognition of "his gifts of expression and grace of delivery."[8] Kadızade's career was now firmly established. With his appointment to Sultan Selim, he won admission to the ranks of the imperial mosques (*cevami-i selatin*). The Friday pulpits of the imperial mosques—Aya Sofya, Sultan Ahmed, Süleymaniye, Beyazid, Fatih Sultan Mehmed, Valide (after 1663), Şehzade, and Sultan Selim—formed the summit of the Ottoman mosque preacher career. In 1631, after serving as Friday preacher at Beyazid for eight years and at Süleymaniye for a few months, Kadızade was promoted to Aya Sofya, the imperial mosque *par excellence*. It was clear that for a growing segment of the mosque-going public, Kadızade had become "the instrument of their escape from the hellish depths of ignorance."[9]

In his sermons, Kadızade used the grand pulpit of Aya Sofya to promulgate a kind of "fundamentalist" ethic, a set of doctrinal positions intended to rid Islam of beliefs and practices that had accumulated since the era of the Prophet Muhammad's Medina. Kadızade's sermons, and the infecting style of his delivery, infused new life into the centuries-old dialectic between innovation and fundamental, "orthodox," Islam.

The lasting appeal of the fundamentalist ethic has its origins in the relationship of the Islamic community to its own past, to the austerity and righteousness of the epoch of the Prophet and the patriarchs of the faith. While the original Islamic community at Medina has provided Sunni Islam with perhaps its most compelling memory, the memory has been a painful one. Every age since that of the One True God's revelation to His last Prophet necessarily means a dreaded distancing from the ideal practice of the faith. With time come changes and deviations. Whether large or small, matters of ritual or dress or social ceremony, differences are inherently consequential for a faith that holds all human activity to be a sacred concern. Innovation, for Kadızade and his followers, as well as for their spiritual guides from the Islamic past, represented a falling away that threatened the salvation of the community. According to a Prophetic tradition (T., *hadis;* A., *hadith*) repeated by the orthodox down through the centuries, "every innovation is heresy, every heresy is error, and every error leads to hell."[10] In a salvationary sense, far from healing all wounds, time is itself wounding.

Since change or "innovation" was held to be inevitable, some accommodation had to be made in order for the community to survive and still hold to the straight path. The historical mainstream of Islam took the position that some innovations were good or at least neutral, while others warranted condemnation.[11] A vociferous minority in

[8] *Fezleke,* vol. 2, p. 182.

[9] *Fezleke,* vol. 2, p. 182.

[10] I. Goldziher, *Muslim Studies,* ed. S. M. Stern (London, 1967–71), vol. 2, pp. 34–35; for similar condemnations, see also ibid., pp. 28 ff.

[11] The innovation controversy particularly in medieval Islam is treated in the *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam,* s.v. "Bidᶜa," and in Muhammad Umar Memon, *Ibn Taimīya's Struggle Against Popular Religion* (The Hague, 1976). According to

every century held to the belief that all innovations were unacceptable. Over the centuries, the issue of innovation as sin remained alive, but its appeal to a broader public depended upon circumstance and effective leadership. Seventeenth-century Istanbul found that leadership in Kadızade Mehmed and, after his death, in a small group of like-minded mosque preachers. They insisted that the Islamic community had strayed from the *Sunna,* the "way" of the Prophet. According to the Kadızadelis, deviation flowed from the influence of the Sufi orders then prominent at Istanbul. If the Sufis were not tamed, the Kadızadelis argued, the entire community would be plunged into unbelief.

In addition to citing specific Koranic injunctions against wine and the like, Kadızadeli sermons focused on a score of controversies that had evolved since the time of the Prophet.[12] Taking the negative position, the Kadızadelis contended that the issues typified the contagion of Sufi-inspired error. Popular belief and Sufis, particularly the leadership of the Halveti and Mevlevi orders, on the whole held the affirmative position on each of the controversies.[13] Denouncing all innovation as inherently sinful, the Kadızadelis especially condemned such substances as coffee, tobacco, opium, and other drugs, and such practices as singing, chanting, musical accompaniment, dancing, whirling, and similar rhythmic movement (*sema, raks, devran*) in Sufi ceremonies for the "recollection" (*zikr*) of God. Other damning usages, according to the Kadızadelis, included pilgrimages to the tombs of alleged saints; invocations of blessings upon the Prophet and his Companions upon each mention of their names; collective supererogatory prayers and rituals of post-patriarchal origins; vilification of the Umayyad Caliph Yazid (d. 683), whom Shi^cite Islam holds responsible for the killing of al-Husayn b. Ali (d. 680), grandson of the Prophet Muhammad

---

Katib Çelebi's simplified version of classical Islamic usage (*Balance,* p. 89), innovation (bida) can be divided into two types. "The first is called 'good innovation': that which was not known in the time of the Prophet but which the leaders of the faith have subsequently allowed as filling a need. Examples are the building of minarets and the manufacture of books. The second is 'bad innovation': for example, in matters of faith the beliefs of misguided schismatics who differ from the followers of the Sunna, and, in matters of practice, the forms of worship invented by the common people on no authority but their own."

12 The Kadızadeli "program" is variously described as having consisted of from sixteen to twenty-two issues. Katib Çelebi, the most authoritative source for the dispute, divides his treatise on the subject into twenty-one separate chapters, nineteen on individual points of contention and two on the history of the interaction between the major disputants (*Balance,* p. 5 and passim); in an early Ottoman published version, *Mizan el-Hakk fi Ihtiyar el-Ahakk* (Istanbul, 1286/1869–70), pp. 14 ff.; cf. Mustafa Naima, *Tarih-i Naima,* 6 vols. (Istanbul, 1280/1863–64), vol. 6, pp. 219–20 (hereafter Naima). The particulars of the major Kadızadeli-Sufi issues are apparently treated in Necati Öztürk, "Islamic Orthodoxy among the Ottomans in the Seventeenth Century with Special Reference to the Qāḍī-zāde Movement" (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1981), a work which was, unfortunately, unavailable to me.

13 The "Kadızadeli-Sufi" issues cited by contemporary observers did not necessarily find their way into the writings of the disputants. Many of the issues are, however, at least touched upon in the following: Kadızade Mehmed, "Risale-i Kadızade," London, British Museum, OR 1165, fols. 53a–62a; Istanbul Üniversitesi Ktp., TY1534, fols. 12a–17b; Üstüvani Mehmed, "Kitab-i Üstüvani Mehmed," British Museum, Add. 5982 and Add. 7837, which was assembled from Üstüvani's lectures by a self-described disciple. Also, Kadızade Mehmed, "Risale-i Devran," "Iman ve Islam Risalesi," "Kaside," Istanbul, TKS, E.H. 1739; Abdülmecid Sivasi, "Dürer el-Akaid," Istanbul, Süleymaniye Ktp., Laleli 2408/1; Abdülahad Nuri, "Te^cdib el-Mütemerridin" and "Risale el-Devran," West Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, ms. or. oct. 3485, and his "Redd-i Asar el-Mütemerridin," Istanbul, Süleymaniye Ktp., H. Mahmud 4411.

and Shiᶜism's third Imam; the use of bribery among officeholders; and grasping hands and bowing down before social superiors.

Insofar as matters of belief were concerned, the Kadızadelis condemned those who held that the Prophet's parents, among others who had predeceased the divine revelations, nonetheless had died as believers; belief in the immortality of the Prophet Hızır;[14] and reference to Islam as "the religion of Abraham."[15] Also denounced were the writings of Muhiy'l-Din ibn al-Arabi (d. 1240), particularly those bearing on the "Unity of Being" (*vahdet el-vücud*), pantheism to the Kadızadelis.[16]

With regard to religious duties, the Kadızadelis contended that every believer was obliged to obey as law the Koranic injunction to "enjoin right and prohibit wrong" (*emr-i maruf ve nehy-i münker*).[17] Those who engaged in so confined an action as reading Ibn al-Arabi, they said, endangered Islam no less than did pilgrims to tombs, who prayed to dead mortals for divine intercession. Both actions were sinful, and both kinds of sinners should be found out and stopped.

According to the Kadızadelis, those who refused to renounce such innovations were heretics who must reaffirm their faith (*tecdid-i iman*) or be punished. Sufi spokesmen, and others opposed to the Kadızadelis, argued that Kadızadeli-labeled "innovation" was either not canonically forbidden or had flourished for centuries within the community and thus stood validated by the principle of consensus (*icma*).[18]

Kadızade's chief adversary, the Halveti shaikh Abdülmecid Sivasi, devoted the last years of his life to the defense of his beliefs and occasionally even of his person. Born in Sivas into a distinguished Sufi family of the Halveti order, Sivasi had succeeded to local Halveti leadership when he came to the attention of Sultan Mehmed III (1595–1603). The Sultan invited Sivasi to Istanbul and saw him launched in both Halveti and vaiz circles. Like a number of the most prominent Sufi shaikhs in the century, Sivasi became a mosque preacher while continuing his primary role as a Sufi master (*pir*).

[14] Hızır (A., Khīḍr/Khaḍir or Hizr), variously identified with Elijah (Ilyas), a companion of Alexander the Great in his search for the spring of life, and the "Servant of God" mentioned in the Koran in connection with Moses (*Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam,* s.v. "al-Khaḍir) and *İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (hereafter *İA*), s.v. "Hızır." The disputants of the seventeenth century focused on the question of his immortality and his power to intervene in human affairs, both of which notions scandalized the orthodox.

[15] *Balance,* pp. 110–23.

[16] The Kadızadelis made of Ibn al-Arabi, dead for four centuries, a special test of orthodoxy. Those who used him as an authority, recited his verse or otherwise followed his example, were held to be heretics (*Balance,* p. 81). On his systematization of theosophical Sufism, see A. Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1975), pp. 259–86.

[17] Quran 3:100. The admonition "emr-i maruf ve nehy-i münker" (A., "al-amr bi'l-maᶜruf ve al-nahy ᶜan al-munkar") is the subject of Katib Çelebi's chap. 17 (*Balance,* pp. 106–9); see also İstanbullu Kadızade Ahmed, *Birgivî Vasiyetnâmesi'nin Kâdizade Şerhi* (Istanbul, 1977), p. 172. "Enjoining right" was an old controversy which, in the opinion of the seventeenth-century historian Naima (vol. 6, p. 218), was rekindled every century by ambitious religious figures in search of a cause. The admonition is also the title of an entire treatise by the Hanbali theologian Ibn Taymiyya (d. 1328), whose attacks on the cult of saints, Ibn al-Arabi, antinomianism and esotericism won him several years in prison and a permanent place in the recurring battles over innovation. His writings, along with those of his chief follower, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 1350), have provided all but indispensable weapons for anti-innovation factions over the centuries. See the *Encyclopaedia of Islam,* 2d ed., s.v. "Ibn Taymiyya"; G. Makdisi, "L'Islam hanbalisant," *Revue des études islamiques* 42 (1974): 211–44; 43 (1975): 45–76; H. A. Satti, "A Translation of and Introduction to *al-Amr bi-'l-maᶜruf wa-'l-nahy ᶜan al-munkar* by Ibn Taymiyya" (M. Litt., University of Edinburgh, 1981); D. S. Margoliouth, "The Devil's Delusion," *Islamic Culture* 9 (1935): 1–21 ff.; 10 (1936): 20–39 ff.; 11 (1937): 267–73 ff.; 12 (1938): 108–18 ff.

[18] Fazlur Rahman, *Islam* (New York, 1968), pp. 61–66, 80–94.

He served for two years as the Friday preacher at Şehzade mosque, and then moved on to Sultan Selim. In 1617 he "was deemed worthy of the honor of scattering the jewels of sermon and admonition"[19] at the new mosque of Sultan Ahmed I and was awarded its Friday vaiz post. He held the position until his death in 1639.

In the late 1620s and early 1630s, Sivasi clashed time and again with Kadızade. Each man openly used his pulpit and partisan congregation to discredit the other. Their running dispute went a long way toward affixing an "orthodox versus Sufi" stamp to the intra-confessional strife of their own and succeeding years.

The distinguishing features of the dispute, however, were neither the set of condemned usages nor even the appealing, if superficial, ordering of the antagonists along Sufi-orthodox lines. Both innovations and innovators fit an established pattern of debate over the place of Sufism, from the sober to the ecstatic, within Sunni Islam.[20] Kadızade and his adherents broke new ground in method more than in substance. They sought to transform what had largely been academic fodder into matters for imperial policy. To that end they managed to shift debate from rarified academic circles to the less differentiated public of the capital's mosques. Nor were they content merely to "educate" their congregations. The Kadızadelis hoped that the support of the mosque-going public would goad Ottoman officialdom into serving as executors of their cause. But in their efforts to mobilize the public, the Kadızadelis went a crucial step further. They campaigned in the mosques for public support of an activist, interventionist, "enjoining of right and prohibiting of wrong." Kadızadeli preachers demanded of their congregations not only that they purify their own lives but that they seek out sinners and in effect force them back onto the straight path.

Few people disputed the authenticity of the command for the "enjoining of right." Many, however, questioned Kadızadeli efforts to invoke it as a public call to arms for the extirpation of heresy. Many Ottomans—ulema, laymen, and members of the Sufi orders themselves—had little use for Sufi excesses. Even to sympathetic observers, many Sufi ceremonies seemed merely to pander to the baser instincts of ever wider and less cultivated audiences. Nonetheless, pleas like Katib Çelebi's for the restoration of society's necessary "balance" seem to have been provoked less by the Sufis' "horrid howls and yells"[21] than by the implications of Kadızadeli vigilantism. It was the active "enjoining of right" that more than any other feature of the controversy fortified the diverse and ultimately successful resistance to the Kadızadeli ethic.

The Kadızadeli program, voiced in Friday sermons, learned treatises and public confrontations, indeed hammered away at the list of innovations for whose propagation the Sufi movement was held liable. But their utterances aside, the Kadızadelis' actual conduct disclosed not only a fuller range of targets but a revealingly shallow level of cooperation from some of their apparent sympathizers.

True to their express program, Kadızadeli violence in the century was directed against the Sufis. Individual Sufi masters were denounced and beaten, and their lodges vandalized, often at the instigation of Kadızadeli preachers. In Kadızade Mehmed's

[19] Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fol. 34b.

[20] M. G. S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, 3 vols. (Chicago, 1974), vol. 1, pp. 359–409; Rahman, *Islam*, pp. 153–202; see n. 11, above.

[21] From the poem by Üveysi (ca. 1620): "Alack, the Sufis fill the mosques with horrid howls and yells alone;/ Ah, where the litanies and chants, and where the whispered call on God?" (translated in E. J. W. Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, 6 vols. [London, 1958–67], vol. 3, p. 218).

day, and in part at his urging, Sultan Murad IV shut down taverns and coffeehouses and outlawed tobacco and wine. In the 1630s Murad had a number of taverns destroyed, and thousands of smokers were executed for defying his ban on tobacco.[22] These Kadızadeli successes, however, were scored less against Sufi rituals than against social practices which the Sufis allegedly abetted. Contemporary Sufis were discomforted by the relentless barrage of Kadızadeli sermons, but, throughout, the Sufi movement had its protectors. Not the least of these, after a fashion, was Murad IV himself.

With Kadızade Mehmed himself in the pulpit and Murad on the throne, the Kadızadelis emerged as a distinct and authoritative faction. Sultan Murad, however, always more user then used, was scarcely a thoroughgoing Kadızadeli. He remained selective in his approaches to the Kadızadeli program and its agents. The Kadızadelis offered up a tempting set of prohibitions that promised to serve the Sultan as well as God; thus Murad put the weight of the state behind those injunctions that seemed likely to tame his unruly subjects. For Murad, taverns and coffeehouses were hatcheries for sedition. Coffee, tobacco, and wine were dangerous facilitators of public assembly and shared confidences. The vaizan may have seen in them sinful innovation and devilish competition for their mosques.[23] Murad was anxious to limit the opportunities and locales that might give rise to rebellion.

Murad appears to have had little quarrel with Sufi ceremonies, however animated, provided that their attractions remained nonpolitical. During his reign, Sufi lodges and their adherents were never systematically disturbed. Murad, in fact, was a masterful manager of Sufi popularity as well as Kadızadeli zeal. His ability to make use of both is nowhere more apparent than in the palace's relationship with Kadızade Mehmed's Sufi nemeses. Like so many of his imperial forebears, Murad had strong personal ties to certain of the Sufi orders. His mother, the dowager Kösem (d. 1651), a power in her own right, was a generous Halveti benefactress.[24] Murad himself, upon his accession in 1623, had been girded with the dynastic sword by the venerable Üsküdari Aziz Mahmud Hüdai (d. 1628–29), shaikh of the Celveti Sufi order and beloved pir of Murad's father, Sultan Ahmed I (d. 1617).[25] In the course of Murad's reign, he became fond of the Mevlevi shaikh Doğani Ahmed Dede (d. 1630), who was invited to the palace to perform the Mevlevi sema especially for the Sultan.[26] In later years, when Kadızade Mehmed began to enjoy favor at court, Kadızade's chief rival, Abdülmecid Sivasi, was also singled out for lavish honors. Murad is said to have personally assured Sivasi that he would not interfere with "the ulema who with books, the scribes who with pens, inkwells and writing tools, the dervishes who with rosaries,

[22] Naima, vol. 3, pp. 160–64, 168–72, 179; *Fezleke*, vol. 2, p. 154; Paul Rycaut, *The History of the Turkish Empire from the Year 1623 to the Year 1677*, 2 vols in 1 (London, 1680), vol. 1, pp. 52, 59, 71, 79; Antoine Galland, *De l'Origine et du progrez du café* (Caen, 1699); Dimitrie Cantemir, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Othman Empire*, trans. N. Tindal (London, 1734), p. 246.

[23] According to Galland (*Origine*, pp. 54–57), competition for audiences may have been the real reason behind preachers' opposition to the coffeehouses, which were often full at prayer time, while the mosques stood empty. See the historian Ibrahim Peçevi, quoted in B. Lewis, *Istanbul and the Civilization of the Ottoman Empire* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1963), p. 133.

[24] J. von Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, 10 vols. (Budapest, 1827–35), vol. 5, p. 547.

[25] Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fols. 35a–b.

[26] Mehmet Ziya, *Yenikapı Mevlevihanesi* (Istanbul, n.d.), pp. 113–18.

carpets and cowl go about and gather together."[27] However Murad may have regarded the manifold activities of the Sufi lodges, on the whole he left them to themselves. Whether or not the Sufi way encouraged sin was of less importance to Murad than the political implications of Sufi practices. And Murad, like the bulk of his predecessors, found them either supportive or benign.

Significantly, for thirteen years of his seventeen-year reign, Murad chose as his Şeyhülislam Zekeriyazade Yahya (d. 1644), who was not only an esteemed jurist but a staunch friend of the Sufi lodges and an accomplished poet. Some of his most famous verses extolled the virtues of drinking the mystic's "wine."[28] The Sufis understood in Yahya's tavern imagery the mystic's thirst for the "wine" of divine Truth and the rapturous "drunkenness" of attainment to the Godhead. The Kadızadelis saw dangerous encouragement to sin, both in the Koranically forbidden wine and in the reprehensible notion of "reunion" in God. More than once Yahya was denounced from Kadızadeli pulpits.[29] He nonetheless retained Murad's favor despite his imperturbable Sufi sympathies and Kadızadeli efforts to unseat him.

The Kadızadelis achieved greater success against the Sufis when the Ottoman throne passed to Murad's less able heirs. The movement's second burst of influence occurred in the latter part of the reign of the distracted Ibrahim I (1640–48) and in the first years of Mehmed IV (1648–87), who assumed the throne at the age of seven. Taking advantage of the disarray in leadership under "mad" Ibrahim and the child Mehmed, the Kadızadelis found in Üstüvani Mehmed from Damascus (d. 1661) a champion to forge a formal link between Kadızadeli pulpits and the palace.

Üstüvani Mehmed, a Damascene by birth and education, began a career as a mosque preacher and lecturer soon after his arrival in Istanbul around 1629.[30] In 1655, when he was close to fifty years old, he was named Friday vaiz at Fatih. Until Üstüvani's banishment the following year, Fatih was the unofficial Kadızadeli headquarters even though the vaizan slots at higher-ranked Aya Sofya and Beyazid also tended to be filled by Kadızadeli preachers.[31] Prior to his Fatih appointment, Üstüvani had already secured a following among the armed servitor-guardsmen of the imperial palace—the *Baltacıs*, *Bostancıs*, *Kapıcıs*, and *Helvacıs*, who so often provided the firepower behind succession struggles.[32] Through such guardsmen, Üstüvani was introduced into the palace and, in a departure from custom, installed as their regular preacher.[33]

Well before his several promotions, Üstüvani had adopted Kadızade's stance on the Sufi orders. For the better part of his career in Istanbul, he urged his listeners to attack not only regular Sufi brethren but also mere visitors to their lodges. Those seized would be given a choice between renewing their faith or death. In either case,

27 Naima, vol. 3, p. 163.

28 *Fezleke*, vol. 2, pp. 39, 231–32; Naima, vol. 4, pp. 59–62; Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmani*, 4 vols. (Istanbul, 1308–15/1891–97), vol. 4, p. 636; Müstakimzade Süleyman Sadeddin, *Devhat el-Meşayıh ma Zeyl*, pp. 46–48.

29 Naima, vol. 5, p. 55.

30 Ibid., pp. 53–54, 264; Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fol. 248a; *Sicil*, vol. 4, p. 173.

31 Ama Kösec Mehmed (d. 1672), a student of Kadızade Mehmed and, like Kadızade, a native of Balıkesir, was at Beyazid from 1647 to 1663–64. Bosnevi Osman (d. 1664) presided at Aya Sofya from 1651 to 1664 (Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fols. 249a, 256a).

32 That is, Halberdiers, Gardeners, Gatekeepers, and Sweetsmakers, all of whom were armed imperial guardsmen. For their support of Üstüvani, see Naima, vol. 5, pp. 53–59.

33 Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fol. 248a.

the lodges in question were to be leveled. Without the state's official backing, Üstüvani could take pleasure only in whatever "enjoining of right" the aroused members of his congregations might undertake on their own. In 1651, however, Üstüvani managed to secure the support of the Grand Vezir. Persuaded by Üstüvani's diatribe against the Halveti lodge at Demirkapı, Grand Vezir Melek Ahmed Pasha (d. 1662) issued an order for the lodge's destruction. After the Kadızadelis carried out the order, they argued that they were empowered to go after all Sufi lodges. Unfortunately for the Kadızadelis, Sufi defenders drove off the attackers from their next destination, once again a Halveti lodge. The lodge was that of Sivasi Efendi's cousin and disciple Mısri Ömer (d. 1659), who had just been named Friday vaiz at Süleymaniye.[34]

Undeterred, Üstüvani and the Kadızadelis made their next move, again approaching an Ottoman official. On this occasion their quarry was the Şeyhülislam, the head of the ulema hierarchy and, as Grand *Müfti,* official dispenser of legal opinions (*fetva*) for the empire. The Şeyhülislam, Bahai Mehmed (d. 1654), was asked to issue a fetva regarding the Sufis' music and rhythmic turning. Although Bahai was not strictly opposed to the Sufis or their rituals, his fetva substantially bolstered Kadızadeli positions. The Kadızadelis seized upon it to threaten yet another Halveti shaikh, but the intended victim refused to be cowed. Having secured an interview with the Şeyhülislam, he warned that the fetva, however correct in juristic terms, would excite city-wide carnage.[35] Bahai's own cousin, the former Şeyhülislam Sadeddinzade Ebusaid (d. 1662), reminded him of their family's long and fruitful association with notables of the dervish orders.[36] Won over, Bahai ordered the judge of Istanbul to punish any preacher who so much as denounced the Sufis. With the Şeyhülislam effectively countermanding his own fetva, the Kadızadelis were again denied formal legal sanction.

Bahai's fetva condemning Sufi excesses had sustained the positions taken by the most revered of his Şeyhülislam predecessors—Kemal Pashazade Şemseddin Ahmed (d. 1534) and Ebussuud Mehmed (d. 1574) among them—to whom similar questions had been posed.[37] Still, as Bahai took care to explain, neither he nor they countenanced the forceful prohibition of Sufi ceremonies much less the physical abuse of Sufi brethren.[38] The Şeyhülislam was not simply a jurisconsult dealing in legal abstractions. As a state official appointed by the Sultan, he was ultimately answerable for the real-life implications of his judgments. His office was a political one, and he was obliged to engage in the concrete affairs of court and empire. As head of the official religious

[34] Naima, vol. 5, pp. 56–57; Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fols. 246b–247a; Uşakizade, p. 549. With his appointment to Süleymaniye, Ömer replaced the Kadızadeli Bosnevi Osman, who had moved up to Aya Sofya (above, n. 31).

[35] Naima, vol. 4, p. 57.

[36] Ibid., p. 58.

[37] Ibid., pp. 56–57; *İA,* s.v. "Ebüssu'ûd," and "Kemâl Pashazâde"; Taşköprüzade Ahmed, *Eš-Šaqâʾiq en-Noʿmânijje,* trans. O. Rescher (Istanbul, 1927), pp. 243–45; Ali Mınık, *El-ʿIqd el-Manẓûm fî Ḏikr Afâḍil er-Rûm,* trans. O. Rescher (Stuttgart, 1934), pp. 81–85; M. E. Düzdağ, *Şeyhülislâm Ebussuud Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı* (Istanbul, 1972); "Fetava-i Ebussuud," London, British Museum, Add. 7833 (esp. fols. 274–99, for Ebussuud and Kemal Pashazade, inter alia, on Sufis and heresy) and Add. 5977 (fols. 54b–56a); West Berlin, Staatsbibiliothek, ms. or. oct. 2391, "Fetava-i Kemal Pashazade." Şeyhülislams Çivizade Muhiyeddin Mehmed (d. 1547) and Mustafa Sunullah (d. 1612), the latter specifically regarding smoking, were also cited by the Kadızadelis; *Šaqâʾiq,* pp. 446–48; Atai, pp. 552–57; Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, ed., *Mevlânâ Müzesi Yazmalar Kataloğu,* 3 vols. (Ankara, 1972), vol. 2, p. 221.

[38] Naima, vol. 5, pp. 57–58.

hierarchy (*ilmiye*), he had charge of appointments and dismissals and virtually all personnel matters affecting the hundreds of principal judges and professors in the realm. Moreover, imperial preachers, Sufi pirs, and the Commander of the Prophet's Descendants (*Nakibüleşraf*) were appointed upon the concurrence—if not the recommendation—of the Şeyhülislam. With such mundane matters bearing down on them, many Şeyhülislams necessarily possessed a pragmatic side. They were sensitive to their various responsibilities—and constituencies—as when their fetva pronouncements were taken by others as directives.

Kadızadeli efforts to obtain a fetva from the incumbent Şeyhülislam testify to the fetva's ambiguous legal status and the several roles of the Şeyhülislam. The Kadızadelis were well aware that some of the most illustrious Ottoman Şeyhülislams had issued fetvas that could be seen as supporting Kadızadeli views. Indeed, the Kadızadelis called attention to such documents in their campaign.[39] In addition to invoking the giants of Ottoman jurisprudence, however, the Kadızadelis went out of their way to gain support from the incumbent Şeyhülislam. On the one hand, the incumbent's own fetva provided the Kadızadelis with some evidence as to whether he was with them or against them. Moreover, contemporary fetvas were pursued in the realization that all fetvas, even those of Ebussuud and Kemal Pashazade, were not only nonbinding opinions, but generational ones at that. The demand for the living authority's opinion reflected the need to reaffirm legal norms in the face of popular religious forms which, though condemned time and again, survived and even thrived. It was not enough that Ebussuud or some other, citing the opinion of "the great teachers of the Hanefi rite,"[40] pronounced Sufi whirling or chanting impermissible. The opinion of Bahai Mehmed, pale imitation of the greats and an unrepentant smoker to boot,[41] was required for those who would "enjoin right" in the current generation. Apart from influencing Bahai's dismissal should he demur, the Kadızadelis intended to prove that their self-appointed mission lay within legal bounds.

In another effort to legitimize their campaign, the Kadızadelis rallied around their primary texts and manuals of action, the writings of Birgili Mehmed. Unlike his readers in later centuries, Birgili was a product of the glory years of the empire. In his lifetime the empire had doubled in size, and expansive times had seemed sure to continue. Birgili himself, however, remained unreconciled to the tokens of worldly fortune. He devoted himself to teaching and writing at the remote medrese that his patron Ataullah, the tutor of Sultan Selim II (1566–74), had founded for him in the town of Birgi, near Izmir.[42] He lived a simple, pious life, and "ever zealous to revive the Sunna of the Prophet by enjoining right and forbidding wrong,"[43] he insisted that others do the same.

39 Ibid., pp. 56–57.

40 That is, in accordance with the teachings of the founding jurists of the Hanefi rite of Sunni Islam, testimony of which was registered in the customary opening formula of an Ottoman fetva.

41 *Fezleke,* vol. 2, p. 396; *Ilmiye Salnamesi* (Istanbul, 1334/1918), pp. 458–59. It was in fact Bahai who, in his first term as Şeyhülislam (1649–51), became the first Şeyhülislam to pronounce tobacco licit (Naima, vol. 5, p. 63).

42 Atai, p. 179; *Sicil,* vol. 4, p. 121; *İA,* s.v. "Birgivi."

43 *Balance,* p. 129.

Birgili's seventeenth-century following relied chiefly on his two most important works, the "Risale-i Birgili Mehmed"[44] and "Tarikat-i Muhammadiye."[45] The "Risale" attempted to eliminate ambiguities of faith or belief by providing the community with a catechism of fundamentals in simple Turkish prose. Before long, the "Risale" became the most widely read and cited "Kadızadeli" tract, although Kadızade and Üstüvani each subsequently authored similar works.[46] The seventeenth-century throngs that turned out to hear the most popular vaizan expressed the public's need for more coherent religious instruction. Except for the highest layers of the population, the ulema's medreses failed to meet that need. Birgili's writings, like the vaizan's simple and direct sermons, filled the void at a moment when social and economic turmoil made the population's need especially acute.

In his "Risale," Birgili adduced proofs from the Koran, from the traditions of the Prophet, and from the writings of the patriarchal authorities to designate "the straight path." He addressed such subjects as the scriptures, the prophets, miracles and saints, those whose lot is heaven or hell; the portents of Judgment Day; those things that are by holy law enjoined, permissible, neutral, abominable, or forbidden; love of grandeur, lying, stubbornness, and other hallmarks of the unethical life; patience, generosity, piety, and other ethics; the proper rearing of children; conditions under which women may venture outside their homes; kinds and occasions of prayer; and the nature and substance of innovation. His "Tarikat," originally in Arabic, was intended for more learned audiences. Its treatment of the issues taken up in the "Risale" was more elaborate, with more space given to the canonical authorities underlying Birgili's positions. In common with fundamentalists before and since, Birgili "attached no importance to custom and usage."[47] That is, the fact that the community had embraced a particular practice could not compensate for the lack of a Koranic or hadith-based authority.

Birgili's writings were jealously guarded by the Kadızadelis as well as cherished by the population. Because of his immense repute, the testimony of his beliefs was invaluable. Indeed, the Kadızadelis came to regard criticisms of Birgili as an intolerable derision of themselves. Thus in the Üstüvani years, when two Halveti partisans wrote refutations of Birgili, the Kadızadelis took action, appealing both to the

[44] Birgili himself did not give the work a title. Written in Turkish in 1562-63, it is variously known as the "Vasiy(y)etname," "Ilmihal," or "Risale" of Birgili (or Birgivi) Mehmed; see Nihal Atsız, *İstanbul Kütüphanelerine göre Birgili Mehmed Efendi . . . Bibliyografyası* (Istanbul, 1966), pp. 5-11, for publications and extant manuscripts. In the eighteenth century, Kadızade Istanbullu Ahmed wrote a commentary (*şerh*) on the "Risale" which was published for the first time in Istanbul in 1803, a year after the publication of the "Risale" itself. The first translations into a European language were done in French: Echialle Mufti, *Religion ou théologie des turcs par Echialle Mufti* (Brussels, 1707); Garcin de Tassy, *Exposition de la foi musulmane, traduite du turc de Mohammed ben Pir-Ali Elberkevi* (Paris, 1822).

[45] Birgili's "Tarikat," written in Arabic, was completed in 1572; see Atsız, *Birgili,* pp. 15-32, for publications and extant manuscripts. There are several early translations into Turkish, including Istanbul, TKS, R427, attributed in the TKS catalogue to "a person named Mehmed Ismeti." This is undoubtedly Birgili's grandson, Ismeti Mehmed b. Fazlullah b. Birgili Mehmed, who died in 1665; *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi Türkçe Yazmalar Kataloğu,* ed. Fehmi Edhem Karatay, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1961), vol. 1, p. 34. A recent published version is the Turkish translation from the Arabic by Celal Yıldırım, *Tarikat-i Muhammediyye Tercümesi* (Istanbul, 1981).

[46] See n. 13, above.

[47] *Balance,* p. 60; Birgili, *Tarikat Tercümesi,* pp. 34-41.

Şeyhülislam and the Sultan.[48] By a series of maneuvers, none of them directly confronting the arguments raised by the tracts, the Kadızadelis pressed their point. They claimed that the two authors, disciples of the Halveti shaikh Abdülahad Nuri (d. 1651)—nephew, son-in-law, and successor of Sivasi Efendi and the Friday vaiz at Aya Sofya[49]—falsely accused Birgili of using weak prophetic traditions to sustain his views.

Failing to persuade the Şeyhülislam to endorse the writers' execution, Üstüvani and his followers put more pressure on the Sultan through their adherents in the palace. The Sultan responded by convening a council of ulema to settle the quarrel. Unlike the vigilantism and calls for execution for which the Kadızadelis had also sought out the ulema, on this occasion the ranking ulema of the realm proved to be more helpful. Under the leadership of the Şeyhülislam, the council voted to suppress the more problematic of the two treatises. The other had already been effectively disowned by its terrified author. Thus, to keep Birgili's writings "free of the dust of criticism and innuendo, safeguard the honor of the holy law and defend the good name of the learned and the pious,"[50] the offending Halveti challenges were officially condemned and their authors warned against further activity. By imperial order, criticism of the venerable "Tarikat" and the equally venerable Birgili was forbidden.

The council's decision, it should be noted, was taken at the behest of the Sultan, who had not only ordered the ulema into session but expressly directed them to nullify the "Tarikat" critique. Regardless of the blatant pressures on the council, its decision was consistent with Şeyhülislam Bahai's and other prominent ulema's stand on such matters. Intellectually they could more readily come down on the side of positions like those of Birgili if their pronouncements were confined to scholarly circles rather than used publicly to incite violence and disturb order.

The second Kadızadeli wave ended in 1656 shortly after the appointment of the redoubtable Köprülü Mehmed (d. 1661) to the Grand Vezirate.[51] Köprülü was not overly fond of the Sufis, whether true practitioners of the mystical way or charlatans bent on bilking the public. In any case, when he assumed office, Kadızadeli vigilantism, not the Sufi movement, threatened his vision of order. In the uncertain days leading up to Köprülü's appointment, Üstüvani and the Kadızadelis had begun planning an all-out assault on the Sufi lodges and a fresh campaign to secure the Sultan's backing for their program.[52] It was reported that they intended to eradicate all innovations—in clothing, manners, and architecture, as well as in ritual and belief—that had appeared since the era of the Prophet. Their immediate targets were once again the Sufis, but their goal was to obtain the coercive power of the state to ensure that Istanbul would reflect the Prophet's Medina.

As armed Kadızadelis made their way toward Fatih mosque, Köprülü met with leading members of the ulema hierarchy. The council declared the Kadızadelis' claims to orthodoxy false and their actions liable to punishment. Before the Kadızadelis could prepare themselves, Köprülü had Üstüvani and his chief confederates arrested and packed off to banishment on Cyprus.[53]

48 The entire incident is recounted in Naima, vol. 5, pp. 264–69.

49 Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fols. 241a–43a; *OM*, vol. 1, pp. 51–52; Naima, vol. 5, p. 265.

50 Naima, vol. 5, p. 268.

51 Ibid., vol. 6, pp. 208–9, 235–36.

52 Ibid., vol. 5, p. 59; vol. 6, pp. 224–27.

53 Ibid., vol. 6, pp. 225–26.

While Köprülü Mehmed presided over the empire on behalf of Mehmed IV, the Kadızadelis had no preeminent spokesmen among the preachers who had escaped Üstüvani's fate. Innovation continued to be denounced from Kadızadeli pulpits, and Sufis were badgered publicly from time to time, but there was no major Kadızadeli offensive. Under Köprülü's son and successor, Fazıl Ahmed (d. 1676), the Kadızadelis again came into their own. It was Fazıl Ahmed's lasting affection for Mehmed b. Bistam of Van, "Vani" Mehmed (d. 1685), that paved the way for the third spasm of confrontations.

Fazıl Ahmed, not yet thirty when his father died in 1661, had met Vani Mehmed two years earlier while serving as governor of Erzurum.[54] Vani, scion of a renowned *seyyid* family, was resident scholar and preacher at the Lala Mustafa Pasha mosque in Erzurum.[55] As a former medrese professor and an admirer of scholarship, Fazıl Ahmed was impressed by the magnetic older man. The two became friends, and when Fazıl Ahmed became Grand Vezir, he invited Vani to join him in the capital.

Once at court, Vani became Sultan Mehmed's personal shaikh as well as Fazıl Ahmed's confidant. He was also appointed the first Friday vaiz at Istanbul's newest mosque, the Valide. With Vani's ascendancy, Kadızadeli fortunes rose. Vani's combined role as a mosque preacher and as the intimate of both the Sultan and Grand Vezir enabled him to place a number of Kadızadeli concerns in the very center of imperial affairs.[56] Vani's unique closeness to the two most important men in the empire freed him from the rivalry he might have encountered had one or the other chosen a different shaikh.

Vani drew other admirers from among many of the same men who five years earlier had converged on the pulpit of Üstüvani. Vani proved to be as antagonistic as any of his Kadızadeli predecessors toward the ecstatic wing of Sufism. He managed to have at least one dervish lodge near Edirne destroyed and its brethren scattered.[57] In Istanbul itself, he revived the practice of publicly denouncing the Sufis for encouraging disobedience to the sharia, and as of 1665 had the public performance of Sufi music and dance rituals—the sema, raks, and devran—forbidden. Even the Mevlevi lodge in Galata, perhaps the richest of Istanbul's scores of Sufi lodges and one of the few religious houses at which Muslim and non-Muslim audiences rubbed shoulders, was forced to comply with the decree.[58] He also used his influence at court to renew the prohibitions on wine and tobacco.[59] Over the years he succeeded in enlarging the ban

54 Ibrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Erzurum Tarihi* (Istanbul, 1960), p. 551; Uşakizade, p. 565.

55 Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fols. 263b–264b; Uşakizade, pp. 563–69; Ibrahim Hakkı Konyalı, *Üsküdar Tarihi*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1976), vol. 1, pp. 308–9.

56 Some of Vani's correspondence, including letters to Fazıl Ahmed, is collected in Vani's "Münşeat," Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Aya Sofya, TY4308.

57 The lodge was the Bektaşi shrine of Kanber (also as Kamber or Kambur) Baba in Babaeski. Mehmed Raşid, *Tarih-i Raşid*, 6 vols. (Istanbul, 1282/1865), vol. 1, pp. 139–40 (hereafter Raşid); Topal Ahmed Rifat, *Nakd el-Tevarih* (Istanbul, 1295/1878), pp. 578–79; John Covel, "Covel's Diary," in *Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant*, vol. 87 (London, 1893), p. 269.

58 Sakıb Mustafa (Sakıb Dede), *Sefine-i Nefise-i Mevleviyan*, 3 vols. (Cairo, 1283/1867), vol. 1, p. 179; Konyalı, *Üsküdar*, vol. 1, pp. 308–9. In a talk at the annual meeting of the Middle East Studies Association (Chicago, November 1983), Suraiya Faroqhi suggested that a long-standing Mevlevi financial crisis may have made the order especially vulnerable to a loss of public support and to Vani's restrictions. For Vani's treatises, see also Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Lala Ismail 685/1 and Kasidecizade 663/1 on abominations, religious obligations, the Sunna of the Prophet, and innovation.

59 Raşid, vol. 1, pp. 250–51; Rycaut, *History*, vol. 2, pp. 105, 255, 285–87; unpublished portions of John Covel's account of his stay in Istanbul as chaplain to British Ambassador Sir Daniel Harvey, "Journal of Travels in Asia and Italy, 1670–78," London, British Museum, Add. Coll. 22912, fol. 214.

on wine. At first he had the sale of wine forbidden anywhere within the walls of Istanbul. Whereas non-Muslims had rarely been directly affected as consumers by the ban on alcohol, as of 1670 Vani had both the sale and consumption of wine forbidden on pain of death wherever there was a mosque, regardless of the composition of the neighborhood.[60]

At Vani's urging, military commanders were stripped of even more questionable comforts. Noncombatant boys, who often graced Ottoman campaign tents, were forbidden to accompany their masters to war.[61] In instituting the restriction, Vani had dared to outlaw a widely tolerated army perquisite. In the end, the practice proved to be as difficult to uproot as wine drinking and smoking, but Vani demonstrated that he was mindful that faulty weaponry was not the sole cause of the Ottomans' degenerating war machine. Rather than simply execute defeated generals and refractory soldiers, the Sultan was thus for a time encouraged to attend to the moral climate in which imperial policies were set.

Perhaps more than any other issue, the conflict in 1664 over communal prayers revealed Vani's view of the place of Islam in the state and the proper role of its exemplars. In years past, during especially virulent plague years, members of Istanbul's several faiths had gathered in a grand assembly to pray for the relief of their common city. In 1661, when more than a thousand bodies were buried each day from Edirnekapı, Muslim imams and Christian patriarchs led their flocks in prayer, side by side, on the great field of Okmeydanı on the outskirts of Istanbul.[62] Under previous sultans, prayers had also been said for the success of certain military campaigns.[63] In 1664 the call for communal prayers ended differently. As the Ottoman armies were preparing for war against Austria, Sultan Mehmed ordered that communal prayers be said for the success of the war effort as had been done on behalf of earlier campaigns and for the city's deliverance from plague.[64] While the Şeyhülislam, Minkarizade Yahya (d. 1678),[65] supported the idea, Vani protested. He argued that "the Assembly of all the people of a City into one body did nothing avail or inforce the power of Prayer" inasmuch as true Muslims "had no need of helps to make their Prayers more fervent or more acceptable."[66] The Şeyhülislam insisted on the legality, propriety, and precedence of the practice, and succeeded in attracting additional support from a prominent Sufi shaikh. Vani's argument nonetheless won out. The decree was rescinded, the unwary shaikh was exiled for having "deceived" the Şeyhülislam, and the Şeyhülislam was tacitly chastised. More than the ulema hierarchy, Vani Efendi, possessing the confidence of both Grand Vezir and Sultan, seemed to decide the limits of tolerance and the official path of the faith. As in the case of Sufism, whose casual attitude toward the holy law was said to blur the lines between true believers and those of only tolerated faiths, communal prayers tended to undermine the spiritual, and

60 Rycaut, *History,* vol. 2, pp. 285-86.

61 Louis Laurent d'Arvieux, *Mémoires du chevalier d'Arvieux,* 6 vols. (Paris, 1735), vol. 4, pp. 390-91; Galland, *Journal d'Antoine Galland pendant son séjour à Constantinople, 1672-1673,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1881), vol. 1, p. 112.

62 Rycaut, *History,* vol. 2, p. 81; Thomas Roe, *The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe, in His Embassy to the Ottoman Porte from the Year 1621 to 1628 Inclusive* (London, 1740), p. 420.

63 Von Hammer, *Geschichte,* vol. 6, p. 126.

64 Rycaut, *History,* vol. 2, p. 154.

65 Raşid, vol. 1, pp. 95-96, 151-53, 161-62; *Sicil,* vol. 4, p. 638.

66 Rycaut, *History,* vol. 2, p. 154. Von Hammer, *Geschichte,* vol. 6, p. 126, although also relying on Rycaut, misrepresents Vani's and Yahya's relative positions.

ultimately the political, primacy of Islam. In these years, when the empire was being threatened by Christian powers as never before, Vani saw in religious syncretism a source of military failure and political disintegration.

In 1683, Vani's influence came to an end with the disastrous Ottoman defeat at Vienna. As one of the most visible champions of the campaign, Vani was removed from his posts and banished until he died in 1685.[67]

With Vani gone, Kadızadeli puritanism lost its commanding voice. The Kadızadelis, and Vani's personal vision, sank into the background of Istanbul's religious life. The immediate, concrete, problems of the empire after Vienna had to be reckoned with. Vienna had opened the floodgates to territorial loss. Instead of the occasional defeat lapping at distant borders, whole provinces and armies were being lost without, it seemed, hope of recovery. So cataclysmic had Ottoman military defeats become that the suffering population seemed more willing than before to scrutinize the main actors in the country's disasters, fixing responsibility on those whose inflated words had so often been proved wrong. The ills of the empire seemed more to lie with particular commanders than with Sufi brethren or remote Kadızadeli targets. Indeed, within a year after Vani's removal, the sema was restored to the Mevlevi order.[68] And, too, the message from the pulpit was more likely to vilify secular officialdom than the religious.[69] When the issue of communal prayers was raised again some years later, if there was an outcry against it, it came to nothing. Prayers were held in Istanbul and Edirne for the success of the Ottoman army, then on its way to Belgrade.[70]

Conclusions

Although the Kadızadelis failed in their overall aims, their campaign underscored the depth of divisions within the religious establishment. The longevity of the Kadızadeli movement, the basic unity of its principles from one generation to the next, and its surprising success were rooted in the unbroken chain of leaders who drew inspiration from the academician Birgili by way of the activist Kadızade. The Kadızadeli vaizan were the indispensable backbone of the movement. Their role in the pulpit gave the movement its special public shape. Their place on the ill-paid periphery of the Ottoman religious establishment sharpened the movement's anti-elitist edge. Although the purely religious impulses of the campaign—particularly within the receiving audiences of society at large—cannot be dismissed, the leadership's tenacious enthusiasm owes a debt to the special circumstances of Istanbul's vaizan corps in these years.

67 Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fols. 264a–264b; Fındıklılı Silahdar Mehmed, *Silahdar Tarihi,* 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1928), vol. 2, pp. 88 ff. Vani spent part of his retirement in Vaniköy, a village on the Asian side of the Bosphorus which Mehmed IV had conferred upon him and which continues to bear his name.

68 Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ'dan sonra Mevlevîlik* (Istanbul, 1953), p. 168.

69 See, for example, the controversial sermons on current affairs by Atpazari Osman (d. 1691), Niyazi el-Mısri (d. 1693–94) and Haci Hüseyn (d. 1694). Raşid, vol. 1, p. 475; *OM,* vol. 1, pp. 30–32, 105; Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ'dan,* p. 167; Silahdar, vol. 2, pp. 704–5; Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/2 (unpag. for Niyazi, d. A.H. 1105, Haci Hüseyn, d. A.H. 1105, and Atpazari, d. A.H. 1102); İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi,* vol. 3/1 (Ankara, 1973), p. 484; Dimitrie Cantemir, *History,* pp. 386–88.

70 Rycaut, *The History of the Turks Beginning with the Year 1679* (London, 1699), pp. 221, 538.

While there was genuine concern about the hazards of religious accretionism, the Kadızadeli movement was also a response to the challenge that the Sufis and their ulema supporters had come to pose for regular mosque preachers. The Kadızadeli vaizan were not men of the official ulema hierarchy. As mosque preachers they represented one of many lesser religious career pursuits. In general, the vaizan of the imperial mosques were more likely than ranking ulema to have received their initial training in the provinces rather than in the distinguished medreses of the capital. Moreover preacher training, defined by the needs of public oratory, differed in quality and quantity from the ulema's ten or more graded years as students of the law.[71] While men who became vaizan in the imperial mosques sometimes had undergone the kind of legal training that made them the technical peers of the hierarchy, such men were the exception.[72] In general, the corps of preachers was characterized by lower levels of selectivity, education, compensation, and career expectations.

Perhaps the chief difference between the vaizan and the ulema, however, lay in their functions. In their capacity as judges, the ulema had narrow and defined interaction with the public. As professors, they dealt with the most select segment of the literate, the budding ulema of the medreses. In contrast, the vaizan had direct contact with the Ottoman urban public. The task of the vaizan was exhortation more than explication and the repetition of more restricted ideas and principles than those associated with medrese training, but the vaizan delivered their message to audience-constituencies that were broadly representative of the Muslim population. And, too, the preachers' exclusion from the isolating advantages of the ulema hierarchy tended to keep their personal circumstances closer to those of the population at large.[73]

Institutionally the vaizan bridged the gulf between common believer and ulema grandee. On Fridays those mosques designated for the prescribed communal service

[71] The role of the sermonist and the nature of the sermon are discussed in Tayyib Gökbilgin, "Taşköprüzâde ve Ilmî Görüşleri," *İÜ Islam Tetkikleri Enstitüsü Dergisi* 6 (1976): 179; A. Mez, *The Renaissance of Islam* (Patna, India, 1937), pp. 317–27; S. M. Zwemer, "The Pulpit in Islam," *Muslim World* 23 (1933): 226–27. There is an extensive literature on the Ottoman ulema in these centuries, including most recently H. İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300–1600,* trans. N. Itzkowitz and C. Imber (London, 1973), pp. 165–83; R. C. Repp, "The Altered Nature and Role of the Ulema," in T. Naff and R. Owen, eds., *Studies in Eighteenth Century Islamic History* (Carbondale, Illinois, 1977), pp. 277–87; see my articles "Elite Circulation in the Ottoman Empire: Great Mollas of the Eighteenth Century," *JESHO* 26 (1983): 318–64; and "The Ilmiye Registers and the Ottoman Medrese System Prior to the Tanzimat," in J-L. Bacqué-Grammont and P. Dumont, eds., *Collection Turcica III: Contributions à l'histoire économique et sociale de l'Empire ottoman* (Louvain, 1983), pp. 309–27.

[72] Imperial vaizan who had completed medrese training at least to the point of candidacy (*mülazemet*) for a hierarchy professorship included: Mustafa (d. 1631–32; Atai, pp. 764–65; *Fezleke,* vol. 2, p. 148); Mehmed, "Subhi Çelebi" (d. 1623?; Atai, pp. 675–76); Ömer (d. 1624; Atai, p. 759; *Fezleke,* vol. 2, p. 64); Zakir Osman (d. 1683–84; Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/1, fols. 263a–b); Bülbülcüzade Abdülkerim (d. 1694; Şeyhi, Hamidiye 939/2, unpag.); Hamza (d. 1700; Şeyhi, Hamidiye 940, fols. 138b–139a); Esiri Damadı Mustafa (d. 1708; Şeyhi, Hamidiye 940, fols. 275b–276b). Interestingly, the careers of six of these show a pattern of medrese training, followed by initiation into a Sufi order (for five of them, into the Halveti order), followed by appointment to a vaiz post.

[73] In the seventeenth century, task-free, honorary ranks (*paye*) carrying stipends, livings for ulema between postings (*arpalık*), and ceremonial privileges conferring both status and access to the Sultan and his purse, benefited an increasingly larger proportion of ulema, often down to the rank of mid-level medrese professors. Except for certain imperial mosque preachers and occasional beneficiaries of special patronage, religious officials not of ulema standing did not receive such boons. See my forthcoming *The Ottoman Ulema in the Postclassical Age,* chap. 2, "Origins of the Ulema Aristocracy."

drew men from all over the city. Every Friday the congregation grew or decreased according to the appeal of the Friday preacher. Fame and further income depended on the ability to hold a crowd. The vaizan of most mosques—the graded mosques of the imperial system being somewhat different—were appointed according to the terms of the mosque benefactor's endowment. The opportunity to move up to a larger Friday post or to acquire additional income from posts assigned to other days of the week stemmed from the individual preacher's reputation. If he should win appointment to one of the imperial mosques, so much the better. But that step, too, depended on the ability to attract favor. Unlike the ulema hierarchy, the vaizan corps possessed an institutionalized mode of ascent only on the level of the imperial mosques.[74] For the imperial mosques, as in the ulema hierarchy, seniority combined with sponsorship to decide promotions. Below the imperial level, competitive sponsorship alone commonly ruled. For all vaizan, popularity, whether or not a sermon would find remunerative favor, revolved around making the congregation one's own.

The Kadızadeli vaizan were unusually popular and effective preachers, perhaps because of their departure from the sermonists' usual imitative pattern. Rather than merely repeating past masters, Kadızadeli vaizan commented on the contemporary scene, often calling particular individuals to account. Even Kadızade Mehmed's detractors conceded his eloquence,[75] and Vani Mehmed's sermons were reputed to be so elevating that "he who hears him but once repents his every sin and emerges cleansed."[76] The Kadızadelis were attuned to the value of their public.

The fact that orthodox-minded preachers had increasingly to compete with Sufi pirs for vaizan posts aggravated existing tensions. While the ulema's welter of requirements insulated them from direct Sufi competition for positions and clientele, true preachers of the preacher path (*tarik-i vaizan*) were forced to share their mosques with Sufis-turned part-time preachers—and this at a time when the number of mosques in the city was not substantially increasing.[77]

The violent confrontations of the time centered in and around the mosques, not in the medreses nor even the Sufi lodges. Both Kadızadeli rhetoric and Kadızadeli mobs issued from the mosque. It may well be that the movement itself originated in the direct and personal antagonisms engendered by the struggle between the regular corps of vaizan and their Sufi competitors. Between 1621 and 1685, the Kadızadeli era, some forty-eight appointments were made to the Friday vaiz posts at the imperial mosques of Aya Sofya, Sultan Ahmed, Süleymaniye, Beyazid, and Fatih. If the appointments reflected something of the views of the Şeyhülislams and sultans (or the sultans' chief deputies, the Grand Vezirs), Sufi shaikhs were favorite choices for the five grandest mosques in the city. Of the forty-eight appointments, at least nineteen were of Halvetis, including Sivasi (d. 1639), Evliyazade Mustafa (d. 1647), Abdülahad Nuri

[74] Although candidates for vaiz posts were ideally to be tested, especially where there was more than one qualified applicant, examinations do not appear to have been common. In 1644–45 an examination by the Şeyhülislam resulted in the naming of Muameleci Mustafa (d. 1695) to the vacancy at Fethiye mosque in Istanbul, but the circumstances of the examination are not given.

[75] *Fezleke*, vol. 2, p. 182.

[76] Evliya Çelebi, *Evlīya Çelebī Seyahatnāmesi*, 8 vols. (Istanbul, 1976–), vol. 2, p. 501.

[77] Hüseyn Ayvansarayı, *Hadikat el-Cevami*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, 1281/1864–65); P. G. Inciciyan, *XVIII. Asırda Istanbul*, trans. H. D. Andreasyan (Istanbul, 1956), pp. 39 ff.; *İA*, s.v. "Istanbul," pp. 1214/55–1214/75.

(d. 1651), and Ümmi Sinanzade Hasan (d. 1677).[78] The premier Halvetis of their time, their chief occupation was the operation of Halveti lodges and the indoctrination of Sufi adepts. It hardly seems coincidental that the principal victim of Kadızadeli wrath over the decades was this most "public" of orders, the Halveti, and its lodges.[79] Some four others of the forty-eight were Celvetis, members of a Sufi order only slightly less suspect in Kadızadeli eyes.[80] Regardless of their order, however, these Sufi vaizan shared certain features. Unlike the regular preachers, they were often inserted into the line of imperial vaizan without having had to make their way through the crowded ranks of common mosques. And, while imperial vaizan, they nonetheless did not have to rely on preacher stipends for their living. Given the source of their appointments and the ready alliances between the urban Sufi orders and ulema grandees, Sufi vaizan were also more likely than regular vaizan to move comfortably in the social circles of which ranking ulema were a part.

It was one thing for Sufi rites to be performed in lodges far removed from mosques and vaizan. It was quite another for them to take place within the mosque, the devotional center of Islam. It was doubly galling for orthodox-minded preachers to have the more raucous exercises performed under their noses by men whose very presence in the pulpit deprived regular preachers of opportunities even as it sullied the mosque.[81]

Like the regular vaizan, the Sufis were well aware of the public's value. For the Sufis, the mosques provided a broad stage for recruitment. A vaiz post at one of the imperial mosques and the performance of the zikr within its walls offered additional status and legitimacy as well as a sizeable audience of potential initiates and benefactors. Many Sufi shaikhs, particularly the Halvetis, clearly welcomed the chance to become vaizan. For most of the seventeenth century, the largest and most prestigious mosques of the capital were as likely to be entrusted to a Sufi of the more emotive orders as to a preacher who had labored exclusively, and often penuriously, on the preacher path.

The ulema hierarchy was the point of convergence for the controversies of the period. The ulema were the official guardians and expositors of the faith, the elect who, as in other Sunni states, gave voice to the consensus of the believing community. Kadızadeli attacks on the Sufis were implicitly attacks on the hierarchy.[82] In the

78 The forty-eight appointments represent twenty-eight individual appointees; twelve Halveti shaikhs, some named to more than one mosque in the course of the period, account for the nineteen Halveti appointments: Subhi Çelebi Mehmed, d. 1623?; Üskübi Ömer, d. 1624; Sofyalı Kadızade Mehmed, d. 1631–32; Sivasi, d. 1639; Evliyazade Mustafa, d. 1647; Abdülahad Nuri, d. 1651; Mısri Ömer, d. 1659; Erdebilizade Ahmed, d. 1669–70; Ümmi Sinanzade Hasan, d. 1677; Bülbülcüzade Abdülkerim, d. 1694; Evhad Şeyhi Hüseyn, d. 1694; Sivasizade Abdülbaki, d. 1710.

79 H. J. Kissling, "Aus der Geschichte des Chalwetijje-Ordens," *ZDMG* 102 (1953): 233–89; J. S. Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam* (London, 1971), pp. 74–78 and passim; *Balance,* pp. 42–46.

80 Three Celveti shaikhs account for the four Celveti vaiz appointments in the period: Atpazari Ismail, d. 1642–43; Zakirzade Abdullah, d. 1657; Gufuri Mahmud, d. 1667.

81 The phenomenon was not at all a new one, but the more emotional orders were more heavily represented in the pulpits than they appear to have been in earlier times. The sober Nakşbendi order, historically the order most favored by the strictly orthodox, seems to have had a smaller proportion of imperial vaizan in the seventeenth century than previously. From 1621 to 1685 two Nakşbendis—Seyyid Yakub, d. 1668, and Bosnevi Osman, d. 1664—accounted for the five Nakşbendi vaizan appointments in the period (see nn. 78 and 80, above).

82 See also the anti-ulema, anti-establishment interpretation put by Egyptian ulema on the declamations of a Kadızadeli-like Ottoman preacher in

Kadızadeli view, it was the higher ulema's tolerance of the growing Sufi presence—their failure to curb Sufi excesses and the membership of many of their number in the Sufi orders—that gave license to the wilder forms of Sufism and the encroachment on the mosque.

In 1633, in a sermon delivered at services commemorating the Prophet's birth, Kadızade Mehmed obliquely attacked the ilmiye by referring the congregation, overflowing with imperial dignitaries, to the tale of Nasreddin Hoca and his two oxen. Recalling that the Hoca had thrashed his larger ox even though it was the smaller who had refused to budge, Kadızade repeated the Hoca's defense of his action, "The little one will only move when he sees the larger made an example of." If others wondered at the story, the ulema in attendance had no doubt who was meant. They were restrained from hauling Kadızade out of the pulpit only when the Şeyhülislam reminded them that the Sultan was present.[83] For Kadızade, and later his followers, the ulema of the realm were by definition doubly answerable—for their own conduct and for that of the community as well. If the ulema refused to take the lead against unbelief, others would do their job for them.

Kadızadeli efforts to seize the spiritual and moral initiatives in Ottoman society were only temporarily and sporadically successful. In the end, their austere ethic proved impossible to implement. Sufi sensibilities were too profoundly a part of society to be easily suppressed, and the empire itself had been founded on confessional diversity. Moreover, the faith's chief exponents, the ulema, declined to accept Kadızadeli efforts to systematize inquisitional activism. Although there were prominent ulema among the Kadızadelis just as there were ulema among the Sufis, in general the ulema-statesmen of the highest ilmiye ranks continued to represent the empire's Sufi-leavened theological center.

Cairo in 1711, who read aloud from Birgili Mehmed's writings and railed against the Sufis; B. Flemming, "Die vorwahhabitische Fitna im osmanischen Kairo 1711," in *İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı'ya Armağan* (Ankara, 1976), pp. 55–65.

[83] *Fezleke*, vol. 2, p. 155; Naima, vol. 3, p. 164.